

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, BY JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, CAN., AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY.

T. T. SHIELDS, *Pastor and Editor.*

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ".—Romans 1: 16.

Address correspondence: The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard Street E., Toronto.

Vol. 3

TORONTO, MAY 7th, 1925.

No. 52

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

DR. FOSDICK'S INFIDELITY, AND HIS METHODIST HOSTS.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday evening, May 3rd, 1925.
 (Stenographically reported).

I WANT to read several passages of Scripture to-night: first, in the Epistle to the Galatians, a word penned by one whom Dr. Fosdick describes as "a wise liberal, the most adventurous man of his day": "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." There were in Paul's day some troublemakers in Israel; but they were those who attempted to bring a new gospel and pervert the gospel of Christ—"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Here is the word of another New Testament liberal: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." It may be interesting to read a verse in the tenth chapter of John also: "But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep; and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep."

I intended to announce my subject for Sunday evening, May 17th, with the announcements a few minutes ago. I think I will announce it now: "Will the Methodist Whale be able to Digest the Presbyterian Jonah?—Is Church 'Union' Likely to be Permanent?" Talk that over among your friends!

I have no intention this evening of discussing personalities. I have named in the announcement of my subject the outstanding, or at least one of the outstanding, theological liberals of America. I have never had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Fosdick personally: I have nothing to say about Dr. Fosdick as a man at all. But as a public man, and as a religious teacher, he is a legitimate subject for public discussion; and his teachings must bear the brunt of public

criticism. If any of you want to hire Massey Hall, or any other hall, to discuss anything I have to say to-night, or any other time, you are perfectly welcome to do it. I have no complaint: that is your privilege—as it is my privilege to speak.

I have named, also, a great organization, a religious body. I am not concerned as to the persons who compose that organization: I am concerned with the stand it publicly takes in relation to great religious movements, and particularly, in relation to the great controversy which is now being waged in all evangelical denominations. I know in advance that I shall be described as a “disturber of the peace,” but it will not disturb my peace to be so described, not in the least. I hold that the subject before us this evening is one which calls for public discussion at a time like this.

I have, personally, the profoundest respect for any man who openly takes a position on a religious question. This is a free country: he has a right to his opinions. We all have a right to our religious convictions—and we have a right to express them. But I confess that I find it somewhat difficult to understand the mentality of the man who tries to take both sides at once. In this war there is no place for neutrals. In that respect, at least, Dr. Fosdick commands my admiration. He has the courage to call himself a liberal, he has the courage to express his views; and no one is in any doubt whatever as to his position, if they have ordinary intelligence. But there are those who privately profess to dissent utterly from Dr. Fosdick's position, and yet who support him, and others who advocate the same views, in colleges and in pulpits. My appeal to you, dear friends, this evening, is that we should be one thing or the other: if you are a liberal theologically, let everyone know it. I presume you are not ashamed of your opinions. And if you are a conservative, if you believe the old Book, then have the courage to say so. But you cannot be both, and be a true man; you cannot be both liberal and conservative and be honest, even with yourself.

I say, I have a right to discuss Dr. Fosdick's visit and his teaching. This church was established upon certain principles; it was founded upon the cardinal doctrines of Evangelical Christianity. So, theoretically, is the Methodist Church. We differ on minor matters, but on the great fundamentals of the faith, professedly, all evangelical bodies stand together. Presbyterians differ from us in their church polity; but in their general theological position, they are one with the position which Baptists profess to occupy. Mark,—I say Baptists “profess” to occupy. I am in happy circumstances in one sense, in that it is my privilege to criticize a man who calls himself a Baptist. Dr. Fosdick is everywhere advertised as a Baptist minister. I met a man in a public meeting in Vancouver who said he desired no other name than that of Baptist. He said, “I am a Baptist. What more does any man need?” And I said, “Will the good brother kindly tell us what sort of a Baptist he is. Are you a Professor Vedder Baptist? or, are you a Dr. Fosdick Baptist? or, are you a President Faunce Baptist? or, are you a Dr. Shailer Mathews Baptist?, or, are you a C. H. Spurgeon Baptist? or, are you a William Carey Baptist?—what sort of a Baptist are you?” You know, we have at least fifty-seven varieties of Baptists nowadays; and when you use that term you need to define it so that everyone will know what kind of a Baptist you are.

Some others of you this evening are Methodists. We used to know what Methodists stood for; but it will not do any longer to say that you are a “Methodist.” I know that great Methodist, Dr. Munhall—just eighty-three or eighty-four years young—a regular old war-horse; and as true to the faith to-day as he was in the beginning of his ministry. Now you had better say what sort of a Methodist you are, whether you are a Munhall Methodist—just to use him as a type—or a George Jackson Methodist, or, to refer to one of the greatest preachers of the Old Land (I have heard him on several occasions, and he is a glorious preacher of the gospel) an old-fashioned Methodist, Dr. Dinsdale T. Young, who packs that hall across from Westminster Abbey every Sunday night with the simple gospel of God's grace. Is that the kind of Methodist you are? or, are you a Victoria College Alumni Methodist, that invites a Fosdick Baptist to lecture to them?—What sort of a Methodist are you? These are the questions we need to discuss and settle if we would be clear in our thinking and expression.

Well now, when men come into this city as religious teachers, and train their guns upon the fundamentals of the Christian faith; and when they deny everything for which evangelical churches have stood—whether they be Methodists, or Presbyterians, or Baptists—surely we have the right to reply without being charged with being “troublers” of Israel. Ahab said to Elijah, “Art thou he that troubleth Israel? And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou has followed Baalim.” There is the difficulty. I am not at all concerned about what people will say. I am not making any apology here: I am just stating the reasonableness, at least, of my course in venturing to speak on this subject.

I receive a great many anonymous letters—I don’t often reply to them—but some of them interest me very much. Some of them please me, but none of them annoy me. I had an anonymous—I suppose I ought to call it that—communication last week. A lady came into the office and very shyly said she was going out of town for a month. And she said, “I am not a member of the church, but I am a member of your Bible Class.” I said, “Would you mind telling me your name?” She replied, “I would rather not just now. I may tell you my name later.” I said, “If that is your wish, I will not press you further.” She then put something into my hand, and said: “I have wanted to see you to give you this for the Lord’s work in this place.” I knew it was money, and asked to what fund she wished it to be applied. “Any fund at all. I do not care. It is just for the Lord’s work in this place. I praise the Lord for what is being done here.” I was engaged at the time and did not look at the money. (Later, on going to my office, I found that I had four bills: the first was a twenty-dollar bill, the second was a fifty-dollar bill, the third was a fifty, and the fourth a fifty—one hundred and seventy dollars in all. You may send along your anonymous communications like that as often as you like. (Laughter.) There is plenty of room for that kind of communication in the Lord’s work here.

I got another letter, but I will not quote the whole of it. It described the Pastor of this church in rather unusual terms; and recommended that he should take a course in “brotherly love”. The name applied to the Pastor of the church was “human hell-hound, a servant of the devil”—and then it invited to take a course in brotherly love! That reveals a very interesting kind of mentality. But I have been interested and amused at the attitude of our modernist friends. They bring up their heavy guns; they undermine the very foundation of all our institutions; and when they are just ready to touch off the dynamite, they say: “Will you please read the thirteenth chapter of first Corinthians”!

I say this because I am going to refer to a letter I received from an anonymous friend. He recommended a text to me; and I shall be very glad to preach from that text some time—but I am sadly afraid he would not like my sermon. He says, “Your hearers would like to hear you preach”—hands up if he told you about it. Well, he was speaking for the crowd anyhow—“Your hearers would like you to preach from Mark nine, verses thirty-eight and thirty-nine.” Let me read it: “And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us; and we forbid him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man who shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me.” I should like very much to preach from that text! I think it would furnish me with a very good foundation for what I have to say this evening; for when I find the doctrines of Modernism casting out devils, I will preach from that text; when I find men who absolutely deny the miraculous in the Bible and in every realm of life, performing miracles, I will preach on that text!

Now, I will tell you what that means. I have never been quite able to understand our Salvation Army friends. I cannot understand why a great man like General Booth should have neglected the ordinance of baptism and the Lord’s Supper. I do not agree with his position; but when I see the Salvationists casting out devils in the name of the Lord, and bringing the blessing that they do bring by preaching the gospel of the Blood, I say, “I cannot go all the way with you; but the Lord bless you as long as you preach salvation through the atoning work of Christ.” I cannot quite understand “Billy” Sunday: I do not like some of his antics. Many people have said to me, “You

would not do what 'Billy' Sunday does, would you?" To which I have replied: "I could not." Some things he says rather shock me, I confess; but when I see the blessing of God resting upon his ministry, when I see souls being brought from darkness into light by his preaching,—then all I can say to you is, "God speed you, brother."

But such a text as this has no reference, no application to what ought to be our attitude toward a man who denies the inspiration of the Scriptures; denies the virgin birth of Christ, and by implication, His essential Deity; who laughs at the vicarious atonement; who assumes there is no necessity for regeneration; who ridicules the idea that Jesus is coming again; who, in fact, denies every solitary doctrine of Evangelical Christianity. The text does not mean that we are to bid him God speed. We should rather apply the other text, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." There are a great many people who are supremely concerned for the feelings of these religious teachers who come here spreading their poison. I do not like killing anything. I really do not. I am no hunter: I never used a gun in my life, and do not want to. I felt like it during the war, as we all did. I do not think I should enjoy shooting a wolf,—but if I were a shepherd, and I had to choose between the life of the wolf and the life of the sheep, I think the wolf would die, that is all!

Here is the teaching of Scripture, that the shepherd's business is to be concerned for his sheep. I had a bit of a controversy with one of our dear brethren, a fundamentalist without backbone, in New York. We were speaking of one of the outstanding leaders of Modernism; and he said, "I love him; I think we ought to seek to win him back to Christ." And I said, "I do, too, if that is possible. I trust the Lord will call him back again; but what about the tens of thousands of people who are being led astray by his false teaching, have you no care for them?" I am not thinking this evening of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick; I am not thinking of the Methodist Church as an organization; nor of the Alumni of Victoria College who brought him to Toronto; nor of the Pastor and officers of Sherbourne Street Church who welcomed him to their pulpit,—I am not thinking of them. I am thinking of the thousands in this city, uneducated in the things of God, into whose minds this poison has been poured, and who have been taught to turn their backs upon the crucified Christ of the New Testament. It is wonderfully significant that in this great city of churches, where you can find a Methodist church in nearly every block, plenty of Presbyterian churches, and Baptist churches, so far as I know, no single voice has been raised in protest against the teaching of this man, who, more than any other man in America, is leading the youth of this land and other lands away from the Cross of Christ. I think it time for somebody to protest. ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!")

Nothing is accomplished by mere denunciation. I have a sermon here of Dr. Fosdick's. I have had it a long time. Pinned to it is an editorial from *The Christian Guardian* of two years ago—so I have been getting ready for him. I have a lot of things like that. (Laughter.) This sermon was preached in the First Presbyterian Church of New York City. The subject of the sermon was, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" I wish I had time to read it all to you—only I think I can do better myself! But the sermon is based upon this text—Gamaliel's advice—"Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." Dr. Fosdick argues—I will go into particulars in a moment—Dr. Fosdick argues in his sermon for a spirit of tolerance, that Gamaliel said, "Now, just keep your hands off: if it is of God it will prosper; and if it is not of God it will fail." Therefore he turns to the fundamentalists and says, "Now, you cease from your contention; let us alone. If we are right we shall prevail; and if we are wrong, God will attend to that." Why does he not apply the same argument to Fundamentalism? Why does he not leave us alone? Why should he be on the offensive everywhere against the fundamentals of the faith when he asks us to be silent, and allow him to go on with his destructive work?

There are three things to which Dr. Fosdick gives special attention in this sermon: The virgin birth, the inspiration of Scripture, and the second coming of Christ. Here is what he says about fundamentalism:

"There is nothing new about this situation. It has happened again and again in history, as, for example, when the stationary earth suddenly began to move and the universe that had been centered in this planet was centered in the sun around which the planets whirl. Whenever such a situation has arisen, there has been only one way out: the new knowledge and the old faith had to be blended in a new combination. Now the people in this generation who are trying to do this are the liberals, and the Fundamentalists are out on a campaign to shut against them the doors of the Christian fellowship. Shall they be allowed to succeed?"

Mark—I want you specially to observe this:

"It is interesting to note where the Fundamentalists are driving in their stakes to mark out the deadline of doctrine around the church, across which no one is to pass except on terms of agreement. They insist"—here is one point in the fundamentalists' favor, in my opinion—"that we must all believe in the historicity of certain special miracles, pre-eminently the virgin birth of our Lord; that we must believe in a special theory of inspiration—that the original documents of the Scripture, which of course we no longer possess, were inerrantly dictated to men a good deal as a man might dictate to a stenographer; that we must believe in a special theory of the atonement—that the blood of our Lord, shed in a substitutionary death, placates an alienated Deity and makes possible welcome for the returning sinner; and that we must believe in the second coming of our Lord upon the clouds of heaven to set up a millenium here, as the only way in which God can bring history to a worthy denouement. Such are some of the stakes which are being driven, to mark a deadline of doctrine around the church."

Now, Dr. Fosdick insists that these are not the fundamentals:

"If a man is a genuine liberal, his primary protest is not against holding these opinions, although he may well protest against their being considered the fundamentals of Christianity. This is a free country and anybody has a right to hold those opinions or any others, if he is sincerely convinced of them."—Observe: a liberal may well protest against the virgin birth of Christ, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the vicarious atonement, the personal return of the Lord—a liberal may well protest against these being considered the fundamentals of Christianity. That is what Dr. Fosdick says.—"This is a free country"—I return to the quotation—"and anybody has a right to hold these opinions or any others, if he is sincerely convinced of them. The question is: has anybody a right to deny the Christian name to those who differ with him on such points and to shut against them the doors of the Christian fellowship? The Fundamentalists say that this must be done. In this country and on the foreign field they are trying to do it. They have actually endeavoured to put on the statute books of a whole state binding laws against teaching modern biology. If they had their way, within the church, they would set up in Protestantism a doctrinal tribunal more rigid than the Pope's."

Dr. Fosdick then proceeds to mention some of the points of difference between modernists and fundamentalists:

"We may well begin with the vexed and mooted question of the virgin birth of our Lord. I know people in the Christian churches, ministers, missionaries, laymen, devoted lovers of the Lord and servants of the Gospel, who, alike as they are in their personal devotion to the Master, hold quite different points of view about a matter like the virgin birth. Here, for example, is one point of view: that the virgin birth is to be accepted as historical fact; it actually happened; there was no other way for a personality like the Master to come into this world except by a special biological miracle. That is one point of view, and many are the gracious and beautiful souls who hold it. But, side by side with them in the evangelical churches is a group of equally loyal and reverent people who would say that the virgin birth is not to be accepted as an historical fact. To believe in virgin birth as an explanation of great personality is one of the familiar ways in which the ancient world was accustomed to account for unusual superiority."

Then he goes into a discussion of Buddhism and of the other heathen religions; and says that Moses, Confucius, and Mohammed are the only great founders of religions in history to whom miraculous birth is not attributed. Thus he puts the New Testament story of the virgin birth of our Lord on a par with the claims of other religions which attribute virgin birth to their founders. Now listen:

"Here in the Christian churches are these two groups of people and the question which the Fundamentalists raise is this: shall one of them throw the other out? Has intolerance any contribution to make to this situation? Will it persuade anybody of anything? Is not the Christian church large enough to hold within her hospitable fellowship people who differ on points like this and agree to differ until the fuller truth be manifested? The Fundamentalists say not. They say that the liberals must go. Well, if the Fundamentalists should succeed, then out of the Christian church would go some of the best Christian life and consecration of this generation—multitudes of men and women, devout and reverent Christians, who need the church and whom the church needs."

Dr. Fosdick allies himself with those who deny the virgin birth; and pleads for a church broad enough to include both: those who accept the virgin birth, and those who deny it. I do not know whether you could be comfortable in a church like that—I am afraid I could not.

I quote now the second point of difference between modernists and fundamentalists which Dr. Fosdick names:

"Consider another matter on which there is a sincere difference of opinion between evangelical Christians: the inspiration of the Bible. One point of view is that the original documents of the Scripture were inerrantly dictated by God to men. Whether we deal with the story of creation or the list of the dukes of Edom or the narratives of Solomon's reign or the Sermon on the Mount or the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians"—here it is again—"they all came in the same way and they all came as no other book ever came. They were inerrantly dictated; everything there—scientific opinions, medical theories, historical judgments, as well as spiritual insight—is infallible. That is one idea of the Bible's inspiration. But side by side with those who hold it, lovers of the Book as much as they, are multitudes of people who never think about the Bible so. Indeed, that static and mechanical theory of inspiration seems to them a positive peril to the spiritual life."

Then he goes on to compare the Koran with the Bible. He declares that the same teaching is found in both, only that the Bible sheds off the objectionable features of the Koran and points the way to further progress.

I have here a book, "The Modern Use of the Bible," by Dr. Fosdick. There are some very interesting things all through the book. It is enough to say that everywhere it rejects the supernatural. I want to give you Dr. Fosdick's own words on page one hundred and sixty-three, section five—the chapter on "Miracle and Law":

"Approaching the Bible so, there are some narratives of miracles there which I do not believe. To suppose that a man in order to be a loyal and devout disciple of our Lord in the twentieth century A.D. must think that God in the ninth century B.C. miraculously sent bears to eat up unruly children or made an axehead swim seems to me dangerously ridiculous. Folk who insist on that kind of literal inerrancy in ancient documents are not Fundamentalists at all; they are incidentalists. Joshua making the sun stand still may be poetry and the story of Jonah and the great fish may be parable; the miraculous aspects of the plagues in Egypt and the magic fall of Jericho's walls may be legendary heightenings of historical events; the amazing tales of Elijah and Elisha may be largely folk-lore; and, in the New Testament, finding a coin in a fish's mouth to pay the temple tax, or walking on water, or blasting a tree with a curse, may be just such stories as always have been associated with an era of outstanding personalities and creative spiritual power. Certainly, I find some of the miracle-narratives of Scripture historically incredible.

"Others puzzle me. I am not sure about them. What does the story of the miraculous draft of fishes mean? Is it, as some think, a sermon on the failure of evangelism when carried on without Christ and the success of it when Christ directs, so that the nets of the church are full to breaking when the fishers of men cast in at his command? Our Occidental minds probably miss many symbolic literary devices in an Oriental book and this may be one of them."—Listen!—"Or what shall we say about the physical aspects of the resurrection of Christ? We believe that he is not dead but is risen; that we have a living Lord. And yet we may not know what to make of narratives about his eating fish after his resurrection, passing through closed doors, and offering his hands and feet to the inquiring touch of Thomas. Is it the Hebrew necessity of associating continued life with a physical resurrection that made these stories, or is Frederick W. H. Myers on the truer track when, speaking from the standpoint of a psychic investigator, he says: "I predict that, in consequence of the new evidence, all reasonable men, a century hence, will believe the Resurrection of Christ, whereas, in default of the new evidence, no reasonable men, a century hence, would have believed it."

Thus it will be seen that Dr. Fosdick quotes with approval the opinion of F. W. H. Myers: that unless the resurrection of Christ can be explained on psychic rather than on physical grounds, belief in it among reasonable men a century hence must have perished. Surely this means that Dr. Fosdick does not himself believe in the physical resurrection of Christ!

"Is it the Hebrew necessity of associating continued life with a physical resurrection"! Put that into the minds of young men in college! If you read the book through, you will find that there is not a page that does not suggest the general unreliability, the untrustworthiness of the Bible. How any student for the ministry can imbibe that teaching and come out with any message to lost men is more than I can understand! Dr. Fosdick repudiates the idea of miracles all through; and at least suggests that the records of the resurrection of Christ are not true, saying: "Is it the Hebrew necessity of associating continued life with a physical resurrection that made these stories?" He implicitly rejects the view that these resurrection "stories" were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost by men who had been eye-witnesses of the "many infallible proofs" of Christ's resurrection.

Let us now hear what he has to say in this sermon about the second coming of our Lord. Let me say first that there are two chapters in this book, one on "Jesus, The Messiah", and one on "Jesus, The Son of God". In the first Dr. Fosdick rejects the idea that there is any predictive element in the Old Testament at all. He attempts to explain "the development of the Messianic idea" as an evolution of human thought as against the evangelical conception as a revelation of God's redemptive purpose. All the way through he assumes that this is not a record of God's revelation to man, but a record of man's gradual feeling after God; and that the Messianic idea is an evolutionary idea. But the idea that the Son of God was before the worlds were, that the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world, that in the counsels of eternity God planned a way by which ruined, bankrupt, human nature could be brought back to His image and likeness—that idea is implicitly denied on every page of this book, and on every page of all Dr. Fosdick's writings.

Let us now hear his third point:

"Consider another matter upon which there is a serious and sincere difference of opinion between evangelical Christians: the second coming of our Lord. The second coming was the early Christian phrasing of hope. No one in the ancient world had ever thought, as we do, of development, progress, gradual change, as God's way of working out his will in human life and institutions. They thought of human history as a series of ages succeeding one another with abrupt suddenness. The Graeco-Roman world gave the names of metals to the ages—gold, silver, bronze, iron. The Hebrews had their ages too—the original Paradise in which man began, the cursed world in which man now lives, the blessed Messianic Kingdom some day suddenly to appear on the clouds of heaven. It was the Hebrew way"—Do you observe the implication? It is not God's way: it is not God speaking in the pages of this Bible—"It was the Hebrew way

of expressing hope for the victory of God and righteousness. When the Christians came they took over that phrasing of expectancy and the New Testament is aglow with it. The preaching of the apostles thrills with the glad announcement, 'Christ is coming!'

"In the evangelical churches to-day there are differing views of this matter. One view is that Christ is literally coming, externally on the clouds of heaven, to set up his kingdom here. I never heard that teaching in my youth at all."—He was sadly neglected, I think!—"It has always had a new resurrection when desperate circumstances came and man's only hope seemed to lie in divine intervention. It is not strange, then, that during these chaotic, catastrophic years there has been a fresh rebirth of this old phrasing of expectancy. 'Christ is coming!' seems to many Christians the central message of the Gospel. In the strength of it some of them are doing great service for the world. But unhappily, many so overemphasize it that they outdo anything the ancient Hebrews or the ancient Christians ever did. They sit still and do nothing and expect the world to grow worse and worse until he comes."

I admit there are some extreme premillennarians whose attitude that describes—I do not find many—but there are some people who are star-gazers, who fold their arms and assume there is nothing to do but wait. The Bible, of course, does not justify that attitude; but because the doctrine of the Lord's coming has been misinterpreted and perverted, that is no sufficient reason for denying it altogether. But Dr. Fosdick continues:

"Side by side with these to whom the second coming is a literal expectation, another group exists in the evangelical churches. They, too, say, 'Christ is coming!' They say it with all their hearts; but they are not thinking of an external arrival on the clouds. They have assimilated as part of the divine revelation the exhilarating insight which these recent generations have given to us, that development is God's way of working out his will."—I want you to mark this. I want you to notice how it came about—"They see that the most desirable elements in human life have come through the method of development. Man's music has developed from the rhythmic noise of beaten sticks until we have in melody and harmony possibilities once undreamed. Man's painting has developed from the crude outlines of the cavemen"—That is where you began, remember! Lower than that: you lived in the mud first of all—before you even got into the cave—"until in line and color we have achieved unforeseen results and possess latent beauties yet unfolded. Man's architecture has developed from the crude huts of primitive men until our cathedrals and business buildings reveal alike an incalculable advance and an unimaginable future. Development does seem to be the way in which God works. And these Christians, when they say that Christ is coming, mean that, slowly it may be, but surely, his will and principles will be worked out by God's grace in human life and institutions, until "he shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied."

But these modernist friends are at no pains to be logical, to be consistent. How in the world an evolutionist could speak as Dr. Fosdick spoke the other day, I do not know! Did he not tell you that the next war is going to be worse than ever? Did he not tell you that instead of using steel they would use disease germs? If that is evolution, then God be praised we did not arrive earlier!

That is Dr. Fosdick's position as given in his own words. I wish I had time to go into the entire sermon.

What ought our attitude to be in respect to these matters? Why have I mentioned the name of Dr. Fosdick with the Methodist Church? I have said before in a series of lectures on those extraordinary pamphlets issued by that body, that the world is incalculably indebted to the Methodist Church. I believe the British Empire and the United States owe an incalculable debt to that spiritual movement set in operation by the Wesleys and their co-labourer, Whitfield. But the Methodist Church of to-day invites to its college here, to address its young men, this man whose teaching I have given you—a man who

implicitly denies and rejects all these doctrines. And while this matter of Church Union is in the air, I think you Presbyterians ought to know what you are joining. I think it will be very useful. Do not make any mistake: some of the godliest people alive to-day are Methodists. In the Methodist Church there are great companies of men and women who mourn because so few come to the solemn feast; and who bow before God in earnest intercession that something may come to bring back the old spiritual power and authority of the divinely-given message. Beyond any doubt, God has His witnesses everywhere; and among the ministers of the Methodist Church there are great companies of godly men who are as true to the gospel, I believe, as any man you can find anywhere. But I am speaking now of the official attitude of the Methodist Church: the Methodist Church, officially, has allied itself with the movement of Modernism; and until it repudiates that relationship and readjusts itself, it will have to be held accountable for that fact.

I have had requests from all over Canada, I think, for the lectures that I gave on those pamphlets. They were not reported at that time; but if I am home long enough before June, I am going to repeat the lectures and analyze those pamphlets on "The Christian Hope", issued by the authority of the Methodist Church, and bearing a fac-simile of the signature of Dr. T. Albert Moore. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my judgment, in all the long history of the Christian Church no more infidel literature was ever issued under a Christian name than those pamphlets. I know, of course, that a great many Methodists do not accept that teaching; but it bears the official stamp of Methodism; and it was expressly issued for the purpose of combating that growing heresy—belief in the personal return of our Lord. What are we to expect of the future if these are our leaders to-day?

There is a church down the street here, a Unitarian church—The First Unitarian Church of Toronto, I think they call it. But everyone knows what it is!—it is a Unitarian Church. I do not agree with them; but the name is up, and if you go in the doors you know where you are going. If I went into a Unitarian church I should sit down and expect to hear the doctrines of Unitarianism taught. I should hear their philosophies without complaint. They have a right to preach them. We all have a right to preach what we believe, for we live in a free country. But down the street Unitarianism is labelled. And if you go there and drink the poison, you cannot complain of deception for the poison label is on the bottle; but I protest against that form of religion that takes the name of Christian, and, under the name of Evangelical Christianity, preaches Unitarianism. That is the deadliest thing in the world. When a Unitarian gets into a Baptist pulpit, or a Methodist pulpit, or a Presbyterian pulpit, and sows his poison and does his deadly work, I believe the time has come when the Christians of all names who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth ought to arise and protest.

Dr. Fosdick says that a new era is coming. In this sermon of his preached in nineteen hundred and twenty-two, he pleads for an inclusive church that will include people of both views. When in Toronto I believe he said he did not know whether there would be a division sooner or later; but if division must come, they want to take as many of the old live churches as possible with them. Yes, they do! They are doing their best to sow their poison in our churches, and in our Sunday Schools, and our theological seminaries—to pervert as many as possible before they separate.

I am not speaking like this in respect to Methodists only; but I do believe in this part of the country the majority of our Baptists are true to the faith. Yet if you take certain parts of the States, I believe the Baptists have gone as far as any other denomination. Dr. Fosdick is one, Dr. Shaller Mathews, Dr. I. G. Matthews,—they are thick all over the country. I am not throwing stones at any one else's house. But whatever you are, the time is coming when you will have to take your stand for Christ in the church to which you belong; and decide whether you will longer permit Him to be wounded in the house of His friends. So far as I am concerned, if that condition should arise in our own Denomination, I do not care how soon the division comes. I do not want to divide the body of Christ, I do not want to make trouble between believers; but when loyalty to Christ and absolute submission to the authority of His inspired Word is the issue, I will go out on that and divide any church, or any

denomination, and go with my Lord without the camp bearing His reproach. ("Hallelujah!" "Praise God!").

I must close for to-night. We shall not need to talk like this when we get to heaven,—we shall have plenty of time there. But before I close I must ask, What is the fundamentalist position? Dr. Fosdick and the men of his school talk about our being "static"; we have ceased to think; we have ceased to grow. All through this book you read about the "American college man". Oh, that tickles the fancy of the young men in school, does it not?—"I am a college man. Of course, my father believe otherwise; and after fifty years of putting to the test, he still believes it;—but then I am a college man"! Another phrase all through the book is, "the modern mind—the modern mind—the modern mind". No one learned to think until Dr. Fosdick and his school were born! The interrogation point is a recent invention! Nobody asked questions before this wonderful age to which we belong! Is it true that those who hold fast by the Book have ceased to think? We have at least two thousand years or thereabout of confirmation behind us. That is something. It is something to see what Jesus Christ has done, and the way in which the gospel works.

I was talking to a company of students in a college in the United States a couple of weeks ago about this matter; and I asked them this same question, Are no objective standards necessary? How do you measure twelve inches? Do you guess it? No, you have a standard. How do you weigh sixteen ounces? Just like your wife does when she gets a parcel from the grocer; or, do you put it in the scales and weigh it? I do not suppose I should be transgressing the bounds of propriety if I refer to the matter of the Home Bank. What was the matter with the Home Bank? Well, they played with the multiplication table. That was at the bottom of it. You know, two and two only make four, and you cannot make it more than that. They played with the multiplication table, they did not count things properly; and the penitentiary doors opened to receive those who played with the multiplication table. And when you come to the realm in which you deal with this mysterious power, electricity, you have certain laws which obtain there; and you have to obey them. Last night we put our clocks on—at least some people did, and some forgot—but the sun did not change. We have God's clock accurately measuring time continuously. Jehovah's question of Job is still pertinent: "Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days; and caused the dayspring to know his place?" Long before the mariner's compass was invented, out on the shoreless sea, the mariner was able to steer his course by the stars. In every realm you have certain objective standards by which things are measured, and weighed, and their values appraised. Only in the religious realm does nothing matter! Only there must every man be permitted to be a law unto himself! Does not analogy teach us that God Whom we worship, having made this world, and furnished it for our habitation, and having given us objective laws and standards by which to determine our course, that in the last great adventure when we leave the realm of the temporal and physical to set sail on that uncharted sea—is it not reasonable to expect that He would speak from the skies in such a way that you and I need make no mistake as to the course we should take? We have it in the Book, blessed be God! and in Him: Who is the Lord of the Book.

I want to announce what this church stands for: We believe the Bible to be the inspired and authoritative Word of God; we believe the Old Testament is just as full of Jesus as the New. The roots of the New are in the Old; and you cannot part company with the Old without parting company with the New. The one thing that binds all the books together is the Personality of our Lord Jesus. He is in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and all through the Book. He is there, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world gradually being revealed to the wondering gaze of faith, until at last He comes to the place called Calvary and dies in our room and stead, and is buried, as you saw these believers buried in symbol to-night; He is risen again; He is ascended into the glory; and He is interceding on God's right hand for us to-night. When I look upon the world to-day I agree with Dr. Fosdick when he says the sight is appalling: no thoughtful man can look out upon the world in its present condition without concern. We have seen, I think, the bankruptcy of human statesmanship, and of every human power. All ancient history, and modern history, all current history, universal and individual human experience, pro-

claim the great truth that man is unable to manage his own affairs: he needs a King. Oh, yes! We need the white horse and his Rider to come down the skies, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now"—what for?—"waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." And we believe that the day is coming when the whole creation shall be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God, when all the Christian dead shall be raised again, and the work of grace shall be finished; and the Lord Jesus Himself shall come and take unto Himself his great power and reign.

I do not think that is a pessimistic outlook, do you? If I did not believe that somehow, sometime, my Lord was coming I should be pessimistic. I do not believe in attempting to set dates; I am as opposed to the setting of times, to the making of charts and all that sort of thing, as Dr. Fosdick. I do not know when the Lord is coming; and I am not going to quarrel with anyone about that. I am only sure that He is coming; and that He is coming in Person: "Once in the end of the world Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

I call upon you, whether you are a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, or what you may be, if you believe in the Lord of the Book and in the Book of the Lord, if you believe in the gospel of the saving grace of our Lord as the only message and remedy for this lost world, and the coming of our Lord as its only hope, to take your stand and crown Him Lord of all. Let it be known that you will have no part nor lot, you will have no fellowship, with those who deny the Book: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." That does not mean we should not love him as a sinner; it does not mean that we should not pray for him. But as a religious teacher, we absolutely part company with him and refuse to recognize him as a Christian teacher.

What shall we do about it? How many are there here to-night who are lukewarm Christians, going day by day to your place of business doing nothing for the Lord?—instead of living by prayer, and, in the power of the Holy Ghost, doing His will week by week, witnessing for Him everywhere,—some of you could hear Dr. Fosdick one Sunday, Dr. Faunce the next, some one else the next, and take all kinds of teaching without differentiating between them. Oh, I beg of you, come back to the principle of Elijah: "If the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him." Take your stand one way or another; there is no middle ground.

I know I have been long. Usually on Communion Sunday night we have a very short sermon or go without a sermon altogether. You members of the church will stay a little later to-night, I am sure. I have to go to Memphis to-morrow evening, and I may have to work all night. But I felt I had to give this message to-night, lest any should say I was afraid to speak on Church Union. I announced it two weeks ago, and I had to begin to-night I will continue two weeks from to-night I am glad to see so many of you here. Come again, and bring as many more as you can. Hundreds have been turned away, and hundreds are standing; but you may sit on each other's laps if you like.

Let me appeal to you young men. Some of you are in college where you are having this nonsense poured into your minds. Take your Bible and shut yourself up with God, and let Him speak to you. He will tell you more in twenty minutes than these professors can teach you in five years. Take His Book; get back to Him; and take your stand for Christ. And you who are going out as preachers, what message have you if God does not speak? How men can occupy the pulpit without the Book I cannot understand. I would rather go out as a street sweeper than preach what some of these people preach,—I would clean something anyhow!

I hardly know how to give the invitation this evening, but we never close morning or evening without giving the invitation. You who are Christians, will you not take a firm stand for Christ? and you who are unsaved, yield to Christ to-night. In spite of all that the modernists say, we have a real Saviour. He died for you and rose again: He still lives; He will give you the Holy Spirit; He will make a new man of you if you believe, and come out and confess Him. A dear brother came to me this morning and he said, "You remember I was converted in my own home. I never acknowledged Christ publicly except in

baptism; I never walked down these aisles for Him. I feel I have missed a blessing because I never did it. I came into the membership of the church through the back door." And then he suggested that I give him and others an opportunity to walk down the aisle for Christ. There are some of you here who have never openly confessed Christ. Unfold that banner and nail it to the mast and say, "I am going to stand for the old faith wherever I go." There are some of you Methodists who ought to be baptized; and you Presbyterians, you can find in the Book the ordinance you witnessed to-night. We are going to sing while I give people a chance to confess Christ:

"Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come, I come.

"Just as I am, Thy love unknown
Has broken every barrier down,
Now to be Thine, yea, Thine alone,
O Lamb of God, I come."

THE ATTRACTION OF ERROR.

However others may have profited, we have profited a great deal by one paragraph which appeared in last week's issue of *The Witness*. That paragraph attempted to tell members of Jarvis Street in particular, and any others who might be interested, in general, of the Pastor's journeyings abroad. He confesses now that no mortal man could know when or where he was going from that paragraph. It was so beautifully confused that a Pinkerton detective could not have found it by its direction: in one place the 27th of April was set for the 4th of May; and in another place instead of May, March was named, so that we were represented as going somewhere last March.

But here is the lesson: the editing of *The Witness* is an incident in a busy Pastor's life who has a large church to look after and many other interests extending over the whole Continent. He has to confess that he is unable to give to this important ministry—for such it is—the time and care it deserves. But he does the best he can; and he tries to spread week by week a wholesome meal for his *Witness* readers. Hundreds of people out-of-town write letters of appreciation; but sometimes he does not know whether his own church family read *The Witness* or not from anything they say about it. After last week he knows they all read it! Is this a lesson in depravity, or diversion, or what? We are grateful to all those who asked us what that paragraph meant.

We know what it intended to mean; but, as it stood, no sane man could understand it at all. But we are glad we wrote it in a printing office between three and four o'clock in the morning when we were very tired. That tangled paragraph brought us a great deal of comfort. We know now that people read *The Witness*; and when our big family come to the table week by week and never pass an opinion about the pie or the cake, we shall be inclined to print a paragraph upsidedown, or to mix it up in some way to find out how many are really coming to the table. Thanks heartily for calling our attention to that paragraph of confusion. We will give you another in a month or two to find out whether you are doing your duty!

What we intended to say in the paragraph referred to was that the Pastor would leave May 4th for Memphis, giving several addresses at the Christian Fundamentals Convention meeting from May 3rd to 10th; and speaking also at the Baptist Bible Union Conference which will meet May 11th and 12th.

LAST SUNDAY.

Last Sunday evening Jarvis Street Church was not full—it was packed! It was crammed in every part; and the ushers estimated that at least five hundred people who could not crowd even into the vestibules, were turned away. The sermon preached by the Pastor is printed in this issue. It will be followed by several others on the Church Union question, each of which will be printed in *The Gospel Witness* the week following their delivery. The subject for the evening of May 17th will be, "Will the Methodist Whale be able to Digest the Presbyterian Jonah—Is Church 'Union' Likely to be Permanent?"

The publication of this paper as a missionary enterprise is made possible by the gifts of members of Jarvis Street Church and others, and is sent to subscribers by mail for \$2.00 (under cost) per year. If any of the Lord's stewards who read this have received blessing, we shall be grateful for any thank-offering you may be able to send to The Witness Fund at any time; and especially for your prayers that the message of The Witness may be used by the Holy Spirit for the defence of the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the exaltation of Christ. As our funds make it possible, we hope to add to our free list, from time to time, the names of ministers at home and missionaries abroad.

EDITORIAL

BAPTIST PASTORS CONFESS THEIR FAITH.

The following cutting from the *London Advertiser*, London, Ontario, has recently come to our hand. It was published, we believe, some time last fall; but we reprint it here: first, for the sake of its own intrinsic worth; and secondly, for the sake of the example it sets to Baptists everywhere:

"Editor of the Advertiser:

Sir,—In view of the recent local discussion regarding the avowed doctrinal position of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, the Baptist ministers of the city of London are unanimously of the opinion that urgent need exists for a declaration of the faith they hold and preach as ministers of the gospel, and subscribe to the following truths:

The trinity of the Godhead.

The virgin birth and deity of Christ.

The personality of the Holy Spirit.

The inspiration, infallibility and authority of the holy scriptures.

The substitutionary atonement.

The necessity of the new birth.

The second coming of Christ.

The life everlasting of believers and the endless punishment of the impenitent.

BOWLEY GREEN,

Pastor, Talbot Street Baptist Church.

R. J. MURPHY,

Pastor, Wortley Road Baptist Church.

W. M. MACDONALD,

Pastor, Maitland Street Baptist Church.

A. BURGESS,

Pastor, Egerton Street Baptist Church.

G. W. YOUNG, Kensal Park Baptist Church.

"The doctrinal position of Mr. Slimon, pastor-elect of the Adelaide Street Baptist Church, is well known, and were he in the city, he undoubtedly would have attached his signature to the above statement."

We would call attention to the statement of our London brethren, that they subscribe to the truths indicated, "in view of the recent local discussion regarding the avowed doctrinal position of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick". We suppose by that, our London brethren meant that since Dr. Fosdick called himself a Baptist, and took a position with which we were not agreed, they felt it necessary to issue a clear statement of their own position. We most heartily commend the course of these worthy brethren to Baptists everywhere. Why should not Baptists confess their faith? and especially when, under the Baptist name, in some quarters, the most anti-Christian doctrines are being promulgated, it is well that true Baptists should frankly state their position. The controversy may rage around Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, a Baptist so-called, on this Continent, or in England, or wherever he may go; but all the world may now know that there is at least one group of Baptist ministers in the city of London, in the Province of Ontario, Canada, who have no fellowship with Dr. Fosdick's views!

Honest men are never afraid to give their name and address, for they are quite willing that all the world should know where and how they live. And

genuine Baptists like our London brethren will never be afraid to confess their faith. When, under the plea of Baptist liberty, men hide and refuse to state their position, they have only themselves to blame if honest men regard them with suspicion. We are profoundly grateful for the lead given by the Baptist ministers of London.

Why should not the Baptist ministers of Toronto do the same thing, in view of Dr. Fosdick's recent visit? We hereby give the President and Secretary of that Association authority to set our name to such a statement as our London brethren have issued. Let it be done at once in Toronto, in Montreal, and everywhere else; and if there are any called Baptists who are afraid to show their colors, let them stand alone as colorless Baptists, and take the responsibility of their self-imposed isolation. We say again: Well done, London!

THE ARTICLE OF APRIL 23RD ON McMASTER VACANCIES.

We have heard from Philadelphia that there was need of the article calling attention to the teaching of Professor I. G. Matthews, now of Crozier Theological Seminary; and we have received an application for a number of copies for distribution there. The article has gone home in Ontario and Quebec also. When Dr. Elmore Harris opposed the continuance of Professor Matthews in McMaster University, he was denounced as though he were a criminal; and Professor Matthews was defended as though he were the embodiment of orthodoxy. Now that our adversary has written a book, all the world may know where he stands; and his stand ought to exclude him absolutely from any and every Christian institution. The Dean in Arts of McMaster has himself to blame for reopening the Matthews matter: he went out of his way to reflect upon sincere believers who object to Dr. Matthews' infidelity. The whole Denomination will now know what to expect from Dr. McLay in any controversy about the fundamentals of the faith. Although the head of an important department of a Baptist Educational Institution, he is either ignorant of, or indifferent to, the great evangelical principles for which Baptists stand. We would recommend to the Faculty of McMaster, and to its Senate and Board of Governors, the worthy example of the Baptist ministers of London.

Baptists never had such an opportunity as faces them in Ontario and Quebec to-day. Tens of thousands of sincere believers are unsettled on account of the Church Union question, and also on account of the modernist-fundamentalist controversy; and the Lord's sheep among them are looking for good pasture: they are asking for direction. Where is our Baptist leadership in a time like this? Why has *The Canadian Baptist* nothing to say upon these tremendous issues? If the Editor cannot write editorials himself, why does he not get some other Baptist voice to speak from his editorial pulpit? And what of McMaster University? We have had it dinned into our ears for a generation that the great need of the church is "leadership". What leadership is McMaster University affording in this crisis-hour? Why should not its Chancellor and its professors be sent forth as flaming prophets preaching the old evangel, rallying our people everywhere to the Baptist standard?

We quote again the words we quoted on April 23 from the speech of Mr. S. J. Moore at the London Convention:

"The Board of Governors did not find themselves in a position where they could submit to this Convention to-day any plan definite enough with respect to the enlargement of the borders of the University; and, therefore, have not submitted such a plan. There is one primary need that must be met before that appeal can be made—and that is, that there should be clearly and unmistakably in the minds of our people the conviction that the University deserves the sacrifice which they are asked to make."

How could the University be more firmly established in the confidence of our people than by the giving of such a testimony as we have referred to? Let the people who call themselves leaders, and who talk so much about "trained leadership", really lead; and they will find, if the leadership given is true to Baptist principle, the whole Denomination will follow.

There is another aspect of this question: hundreds of young men and women in loyal Baptist homes all over this Continent are looking for a place where they may find true, Baptist, training. It is not enough for a university to

incorporate in its report at Convention time a certain statement of belief. What the Denomination would like to see would be some active leadership in evangelistic and missionary endeavour. If the Faculty were to cease talking about education for a little while, and go out and assist in some evangelistic effort, affording leadership in such work in the churches to which they belong, and thus earn for themselves a reputation for being full of the zeal of the Lord, it would do more to commend the University to Baptists of this Continent than any Convention resolution that could be passed. The time is short! The need is urgent! Let us have done with compromise and with all efforts to be at peace with that which is opposed to the gospel; and let us unitedly lay hold upon the opportunities which face us in this pregnant hour!

The Jarvis Street Whole Bible Sunday School Lesson Course

Lesson VII.

May 17th, 1925

JOB'S ANSWER AND JEHOVAH'S EVENING BENEDICTION.

Job: Chapter 42.

I. The Humbling Ministry of the Divine Word.

1. Against the argument of his three friends and Elihu, Job held his own without difficulty. Judged by all human standards Job's character was without a flaw; and all the arguments of his friends failed to convince him of sin. The fact is, no human argument can work conviction of sin: sin, primarily, is an offence against God; and it is beyond human power to reveal its heinousness. 2. When God speaks for Himself, Job immediately acknowledges His omnipotence and omniscience: "I know that thou canst do every thing, and that no thought can be withholden from thee." Nothing reveals God like His own Word; the truth is, God cannot be discovered; and may be known only as He is pleased to reveal Himself. 3. Job acknowledges the truth of God's Word as applying to himself; and confesses his folly and his ignorance. He acknowledges that he has been hiding counsel without knowledge and says: "Therefore have I uttered that I understood not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not." 4. Direct commerce with God always leads to self-abhorrence: when the eyes of Job's understanding were enlightened so that he saw God with the eyes of faith, he exclaimed, "Now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself." In this connection read Isalah, the sixth chapter; and Luke, five and eight.

II. The Lord Distinguishes Between the True and the False.

The argument of the three would-be comforters is here appraised: "Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right." God hears our words, and passes judgment upon our philosophies. 2. Job, in the main, has been right, especially is he commended for his ultimate confession: "Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath." 3. Jehovah promises grace to the undeserving through the intercession of the accepted one: "Go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you: for him will I accept." In this Job is a type of Christ. We all have been as foolish as Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, and the divine wrath is kindled against our sin; but when the Lord Jesus prays for us we are accepted in the Beloved. 4. The divine blessing descended upon the intercessor: "And the Lord turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends." This may be applied: (1) as a general principle. We pray best for ourselves when we pray for others. There is no ministry so rich in blessing as the ministry of intercession; and (2) it may be applied to the mediatorial work of Christ. God is more glorified in redemption than in creation; and the supreme glory of Christ comes from His humiliation: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him."

III. The Ultimate Fortune of the Believer.

"The Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before." 1. The present afflictions of the believer are but for a moment. The time seemed long to Job, but the days of his suffering were as nothing compared to the days of his rejoicing. 2. The divine favour will often bring others to our side: Job's brothers, and even his sisters, had forsaken him in the hour of his adversity;

but when the sun of divine favour shone upon him once again, they all returned to him. There are many fair weather friends still! 3. Though not always here in this life, ultimately the tide is turned for every believer, and our light afflictions work out for us a "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory". The final chapter of the book of Job is the final chapter of every believer's history—"twice as much as he had before". 4. The general principle is true both of the individual and of the whole creation: the book of Job shows us the Devil at work; but in the end redeeming grace is triumphant. So will it be when the whole creation is delivered out of the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

SERIES OF LECTURES ON "THE CHRISTIAN HOPE".

In a former editorial we referred in *The Gospel Witness* to certain pamphlets issued by the Methodist Church, entitled "The Christian Hope", upon which we delivered a course of lectures at the time they were issued two or three years ago. We have received many applications for copies of these lectures. They were not reported at the time, and therefore are not in print. We think we should be rendering a service to many if these lectures were repeated. We have no manuscript upon the subject, but a re-examination of the pamphlets will, no doubt, call forth the same criticisms. Therefore, we have determined to repeat this course of lectures on Thursday evenings, the first to be delivered Thursday, May 21st. These lectures will be stenographically reported and printed. We fear we shall not be able to find space for them in *The Gospel Witness*. We shall therefore ask for a collection every Thursday evening to assist in defraying the expense of their separate publication. They will then be put on sale. If the demand for them warrants it, it is possible we may at the completion of the course on Church Union and of the lectures on "The Christian Hope", have them put together in book form, so that they may be available for all who are interested in these matters.

For the information of out-of-town readers, we announce that the sermons and lectures will be sent on receipt of name and address for ten cents per single copy. We should be glad if all who are interested will write immediately, as this will afford us some idea of how many to print. No reply will be sent to orders received other than the copy of sermon or lecture ordered, which will be forwarded at the earliest possible date after printing. Time and expense forbid that small orders should be acknowledged in any other way. Address: *The Gospel Witness*, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto.

THE BIBLE SCHOOL LAST SUNDAY.

Last Sunday was the first day of daylight-saving time. We have found in other years that the first Sunday a great many people sleep in. When a service begins an hour and a quarter before the time of the regular church service, and the clock is pushed forward another hour, it is not surprising if such a condition should reduce numbers. We expected a much greater falling off last Sunday than was actually experienced. The number present was nine hundred and eighty-two—only eighteen short of a thousand. But we must try to make that up this coming Sunday. We would urge every member of Jarvis Street already enrolled in one of the classes, and every member who is not so enrolled, to make an effort to be present next Sunday morning.

REV. T. I. STOCKLEY IN JARVIS STREET PULPIT.

We are happy to announce that the preacher for May 10th will be the Rev. T. I. Stockley, for more than twenty years pastor of Dr. James Spurgeon's Tabernacle, West Croydon, London. Mr. Stockley has been for two or three years in Jamaica; and is at present visiting this Continent in the interests of the work among Jamaican Baptists. He is a very able preacher of the gospel of the Dr. Jowett type. He will teach the Pastor's Bible class in the morning, and preach at both services. A retiring offering will be received at the doors in aid of our Baptist work in Jamaica at the close of each service. The Pastor's only regret is that he will be absent during Mr. Stockley's visit. We have had happy times in his pulpit in London; and Mr. Stockley occupied the Jarvis Street pulpit for a month in 1913. We are sure that his visit will bring great blessing to Jarvis Street Church.